

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JOSHUA HENRY,

Petitioner,

v.

BRIAN V. COLEMAN, et al.,

Respondents.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

Civ. No. 14-6833

J U D G M E N T

AND NOW, this 13th day of March, 2018, upon consideration of the Petition for Habeas Relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (Doc. No. 1), the Commonwealth’s Response to Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 11), Judge Lloret’s Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 18), Petitioner’s Objections (Doc. No. 22), the Commonwealth’s Response to Objections (Doc. No. 24), all other related submissions (Doc. No. 26), and after a complete and independent review of the record, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. Petitioner’s Objections (Doc. No. 22) are **OVERRULED**;
2. The Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 18) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED in part**;
3. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. No. 1) is **DENIED** and **DISMISSED**;
4. A Certificate of Appealability shall **NOT ISSUE** under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) because Petitioner has not demonstrated that “reasonable jurists” would find my “assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); and
5. The **CLERK OF COURT** shall **CLOSE** this action.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Paul S. Diamond

Paul S. Diamond, J.